

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15, and 16 are currently pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 10, and 13, and have canceled claims 4, 5, 9, and 11.

Claims 1, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-120, 12, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over IP Infusion ("Virtual Routing for Provider Edge Applications", a white paper by IP Infusion, Inc.) in view of Huang ("The ENTRAPID Protocol Development Environment) and further in view of Haut et al. ("Summary: Advantages of shared libraries").

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 7, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement for reciting "at least one client application" which the Office Action asserts is not disclosed in the application as filed.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 instead recite "at least one client." Specific support for this amendment can be found at least in paragraph [0029] of the Specification as filed.

For at least the reasons provided, claims 1, 7, and 13 comply with the written description requirement.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 7, and 13 is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over IP Infusion.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include features formerly recited in allowable claim 5 and intervening claim 4, and have amended independent claim 7 to include features formerly recited in allowable claim 11 and intervening claim 9. Applicants have also amended independent claim 13 to include features similar to those added to independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1, claims 8, 10, and 12 depend from claim 7, and claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 13, and claims 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, and 16 should be condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from independent claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey S. King, reg#58791/

Jeffrey S. King
Reg. No. 58,791

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 858-350-6100
Fax: 415-576-0300
JSK:jsk
61946944 v1